

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER CITY OF ST. LOUIS



Internal Audit Section

DR. KENNETH M. STONE, CPA Internal Audit Executive

Comptroller

Carnahan Courthouse Building 1114 Market St., Room 642 St. Louis, Missouri 63101 (314) 622-4723 Fax: (314) 613-3004

December 8, 2008

Melissa Bode, Vice President, Development Big Brothers Big Sisters of Eastern Missouri 4625 Lindell Boulevard St. Louis, MO 63108

RE: Fiscal Monitoring Review of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Eastern Missouri, Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Contract #07-11-94, CFDA #14.218 (Project #2008-CDA25)

Dear Ms. Bode:

Enclosed is a report of our fiscal monitoring review of Big Brothers Big Sisters of Eastern Missouri, a not for profit organization, CDBG – Urban Expansion Project, for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007. The scope of a fiscal monitoring review is substantially less than an audit, and as such, we do not express an opinion on the financial operations of Big Brothers Big Sisters. Our fieldwork was completed on February 8, 2008.

This review was made under authorization contained in Section 2, Article XV of the Charter, City of St. Louis, as revised and has been conducted in accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* and through an agreement with the Community Development Administration (CDA) to provide fiscal monitoring to all grant subrecipients.

If you have any questions, please contact Internal Audit Section at (314) 622-4723.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kenneth M. Stone, CPA Internal Audit Executive

Kenneth M. Ston

Enclosure

cc: Jill Claybour, Acting Executive Director, CDA

Lorna Alexander, Special Assistant for Development, CDA



CITY OF ST. LOUIS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (CDA)

BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS OF EASTERN MISSOURI COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) URBAN EXPANSION PROJECT CONTRACT #07-11-94 CFDA #14.218

FISCAL MONITORING REVIEW
JANUARY 1, 2007 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2007

PROJECT #2008-CDA25

DATE ISSUED: DECEMBER 8, 2008

Prepared by: Internal Audit Section



OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

HONORABLE DARLENE GREEN, COMPTRLLER

CITY OF ST. LOUIS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (CDA) BIG BROTHERS AND BIG SISTERS OF EASTERN MISSOURI COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG) FISCAL MONITORING REVIEW JANUARY 1, 2007 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Description</u>	Page(s)
INTRODUCTION	
Background	1
Purpose	1
Scope and Methodology	1
Exit Conference	2
Management's Responses	2
CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS	
Conclusion	3
Status of Prior Observations	3
A-133 Status	3
Summary of Current Observations	3
DETAILED OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS,	
AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES	4-6

INTRODUCTION

Background

Contract Name:

Urban Expansion Project

Contract Number:

07-11-94

CFDA Number:

14.218

Contract Periods:

January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007

Contract Amount:

\$90,000

The contract provided Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for matching children with mentors and recruiting African-American mentor volunteers. Big Brothers Big Sisters' (Agency) mission is to help children reach their potential through professionally supported and one-to-one relationships with mentors. The Agency provides youth services for developing positive relationships that have a direct, measurable and lasting impact on the lives of young people, ages 6 through 18 years old.

Purpose

The purpose of the review was to determine the Agency's compliance with federal (including OMB A-133), state and local CDBG requirements for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007 and make recommendations for improvements as necessary.

Scope and Methodology

Inquiries were made regarding the Agency's internal controls relating to the grant administered by Community Development Agency (CDA), evidence tested supporting the reports the Agency submitted to CDA and other procedures were performed as considered necessary. The fieldwork was completed on February 8, 2008.

Exit Conference

The Agency was offered an exit conference on November 26, 2008, along with the draft report. The Agency declined.

INTRODUCTION

Management Responses

The management's responses to the observations and recommendations noted in the report were received from the Agency on December 5, 2008. These responses have been incorporated into this report

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS

Conclusion

The Agency did not fully comply with federal (including OMB Circular A-133), state and local CDBG requirements.

Status of Prior Observations

This was the first fiscal monitoring review of the Agency; therefore, there were no prior findings.

A-133 Status

The Agency did not expend \$500,000 or more in federal funds for calendar year ended December 31, 2007; therefore, it was not required to have a single audit in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.

Summary of Current Observations

Recommendations were made for the following observations, which if implemented, could assist the Agency in fully complying with federal (including OMB Circular A-133), state and local CDBG requirements.

- 1. Opportunity to improve adequacy of accounting records
- 2. Opportunity to have two duly authorized signatures on disbursement checks

<u>DETAILED OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS</u> AND MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSES

1. Opportunity to Improve Adequacy of Accounting Records

Sound internal control practices require businesses to maintain adequate accounting records. In addition, CDA Fiscal Procedures Manual states, "Each operating agency is required to have accounting records that adequately identify the source and use of CDBG funds. In addition, each organization must maintain a separate set of books for each CDBG funded project it has a contract to operate... Those agencies that use commercial software packages and operate several projects are exempt from this requirement if they use a coding scheme or separate set of account numbers to clearly distinguish all transactions and accounts that relate to the CDBG project."

The Agency's accounting records did not identify its funding sources separately. The Agency listed all funds in the category "Government Grants" on its balance sheet and income statements.

The Agency did not comply with the CDA fiscal procedures. Funds may be misappropriated or misused if they are not identified and recoded separately.

Recommendation

It is recommended that:

- 1. The Agency complies with CDA fiscal procedures and maintains adequate accounting records that identify funding sources separately at the federal, state and local levels.
- 2. The Agency's board of directors periodically review the Agency's accounting records and financial information to ensure their adequacy.

Management's Response

While we do not totally concur with the observation, the organization is redesigning its accounting system to capture revenue and expense in more detail. These changes are being implemented with 2009.

<u>DETAILED OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS</u> AND MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSES

2. Opportunity to have Two Duly Authorized Signatures on Disbursement Checks

The CDA Fiscal Procedures Manual requires internal controls "to ensure that resources are used for authorized purposes and protected against waste, mismanagement or loss." In addition, CDA procedures state, "disbursement checks shall be pre-numbered and signed by the chief executive officer and the financial officer or any two duly authorized officers."

Only one authorized individual signed the Agency's disbursement checks under \$2000.

The Agency did not in comply with the CDA Fiscal Procedures Manual's requirements.

Funds may be misappropriated or used for unauthorized purposes when CDA's requirements for two signatures on all CDA funded disbursement checks are not followed. In addition, the Agency's reimbursement requests may be suspended because of its non-compliance with its contractual agreement with CDA.

Recommendation

It is recommended the Agency comply with CDA requirements and have all its CDA funded disbursement checks signed by the chief executive officer and the financial officer or any two duly authorized officers. This will improve internal controls over check writing and minimize delays in processing the agency's reimbursement requests.

Management's Response

While it is true that we don't require every check to have two signatures, we do not concur that all checks require two signatures. The organization will not be changing its current check signing practice. This organization has fiscal policies that have been reviewed and approved by the organization's Finance Committee, Executive Committee and Board of Directors and reviewed by our independent accounting firm. Our audits have always had unqualified opinions, with no internal control weaknesses. Requiring this organization to have all checks signed by two officers is an unnecessary burden on the organization. The federal government, through it's

<u>DETAILED OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS</u> AND MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSES

2. Continued

A-133 audit standards, doesn't [sic] require this level of check signing. Their only requirement is that the independent audit firm is satisfied with the organization's internal controls.

Auditor's Comment

Part 2.2 of the "Internal Control" Section of the CDA Operating Agency Fiscal Procedures Manual_requires two individuals sign all checks. The Agency may obtain a waiver from CDA in writing.